

## **Integrating the Nonverbal Behaviour of Teachers on Students Educational Performance**

Fahim Ullah Khan<sup>\*</sup>, Wazim Khan<sup>†</sup>

### **Abstract**

*Nonverbal communication is synonymously known as sign language including all kinds of behaviors performed in the presence of others; consciously or unconsciously. This descriptive study aimed to investigate the impact of nonverbal behaviour of teachers on students' learning. Descriptive cum observational method was used. One hundred eight teachers were randomly selected out of three hundred sixty four teachers through multiphase sampling technique. Observational form was designed based on Galloway's model of nonverbal behaviour which complemented verbal behaviour of Flanders system of interaction. The main objective of the study was; to compare the nonverbal behaviour of teacher's compatible with their verbal behaviour in different educational institutions. The obtained data was analyzed by using Z test and ANOVA techniques. Generalizations were made on the basis of results obtained by using appropriate statistical tests. The analysis of data revealed that the nonverbal behaviour of teachers were coherent and compatible with verbal behavior, no significant difference was found between the nonverbal behaviour of arts teachers in different educational institutions. Based on findings, recommendation were made that nonverbal communication should be utilized by all teacher, teachers must try to guide and attract the students' attention through nonverbal communication.*

**Keywords:** nonverbal behaviour, rating Score, teachers, students

### **Introduction**

Nonverbal behavior is the nonlinguistic transmission of information through body language, eye contact, facial expression and body language of a human being (Galloway, 1977). Every action by a person that can be heard or seen is called behaviour. Behaviour may be observable or measurable, so that each one working with the student has a good understanding of what the behaviour look like or sound like (Alberto, 2003). Nonverbal communication remains the neglected part of teaching learning process particularly in Pakistan. In order to teach effectively, neglecting non-verbal communication in the classroom would be inappropriate as it remains an essential tool for better

---

<sup>\*</sup>PhD Scholar, Teacher Education Department, Qurtuba University of Science & Information Technology, Peshawar. Email:faheemtayab@gmail.com

<sup>†</sup>Professor, Teacher Education Department, Qurtuba University of Science & Information Technology, Peshawar

understanding of classroom interaction. In every educational system, the role of a teacher holds pivotal importance. Effective teaching takes place when a teacher successfully transmits the concept and the basic ideas to students (Walberg, 1990).

*Statement of the Problem*

The statement of the problem is to investigate teachers' nonverbal behaviors' on students' educational performance.

*Research Objectives*

The objectives of the study were to evaluate, identify, measure and compare the nonverbal behaviour scores of male and female arts teachers, a significant difference between the nonverbal behaviour scores of male and female arts teachers working in government, private, semi government & private standard schools and draw recommendations for teachers to improve their nonverbal cues.

*Hypotheses of the Study*

Following were the research hypotheses:

- The teachers' nonverbal behaviour score is consistent and coherent with their verbal behaviour
- There is significant difference between the nonverbal behaviour scores of male and female arts teachers.
- There is significant difference between the nonverbal behaviour scores of male and female arts teachers working in government, private, semi government & private standard schools.

**Literature Review**

Vocal intonation reflects psychological inspiration, mood and emotion. It also carries social information as in a “superior, critical, or submissive manner of speaking”. Moreover, teachers use proper tone in the teaching of poetry, which is very useful and creates curiosity and interest amongst the students (Given, 2002). Similarly, another experimental research was conducted on non-verbal cues at kindergarten level just to assess and observe the non-verbal interaction of teachers and children related to their verbal behaviour.

A study conducted on “closeness or nonverbal immediacy within the classroom atmosphere” with objective relationship between the use

of nonverbal behaviour and keenness of the audience involvement in discussion(Allen & Peas, 2011).To know and understand how these elements fit together more precisely, Flanders classified teacher verbal behaviour into different categories. The classification presents the most observed teachers behaviour. This system not only ties different methods of teaching into a well-knit system, but also serves as a bridge between general teaching method and a specific teaching skill (Flander, 1970).

Different research studies reflected that the nonverbal behaviour of teachers encourage students' participation but in contrast, negative attitudes pertaining nonverbal behavior discourage students' participation (Smith, 1981). The research of nonverbal communication and Flanders system of verbal behaviour that serves as a useful design for interpreting teachers nonverbal cues, so as to certify its impact on students' learning process (Galloway, 1977). However, it was seen that a great deal of knowledge is communicated through nonverbal cues. Verbal communication does not affect students' minds and hearts as by nonverbal cues that complements verbal message (Devito, 2009).

#### *Population*

All the male and female secondary school teachers in the subject of English, Urdu, and Islamiyat working in Govt, private and semi Govt and private standard schools located in district Karak constituted the population of this study. The total number of schools of both gender were one hundred eighty eight (188) i.e. ninety five (95) government, eighty (80) private, and thirteen (13) semi government & private standard schools. The total number of teachers working in the above school system was 364 (233 male & 131 female).

#### *Sample size*

A sample of one hundred eight teachers (fifty four male & fifty four female) was randomly selected out of 364 arts teachers by multiphase cluster sampling from the defined population.

#### *Instrument of the study*

The nonverbal behaviour of teachers was rated on seven-point rating scale based on Galloway model.

#### *Data Collection*

Teachers rating behavior was transformed to rating scores by using standard criterion. Each teacher was noted by researcher twice himself

during different teaching hours, for about 6 minutes.

Table1: Distribution of sample of 108 arts teachers

Name of educational Institutions	f	Number of teachers per Institution		Total
		Male	Female	
Government boys School	06	3	-	18
Government girls School	06	-	3	18
Private boys School	06	3	-	18
Private girls School	06	-	3	18
Semi Government & Private Standard boys School	06	3	-	18
Semi Government & Private Standard girls School	06	-	3	18
Total	36	-	-	108

To observe how far teachers' nonverbal communication was consistent with their verbal communication, a seven point rating scale suggested by Galloway was used. The teachers' nonverbal behaviour was rated on observational form is as follows;

1 & 2. While accepting positive and negative manner of students in nonthreatening way encourages or praises students behaviour, the teachers' body language is

Consistent with words 1/2/3/4/5/6/7 Over controlled

3. While accepting ideas of students', the teachers' nonverbal behaviors are consistently

Encourages 1/2/3/4/5/6/7 discourages

4. While asking questions, teacher

Maintain eye contact 1/2/3/4/5/6/7 avoid eye contact

5. While lecturing, teacher ensures by using;

Different body language 1/2/3/4/5/6/7 or avoid

6. While giving directions, teachers' nonverbal behaviour

Encourage students 1/2/3/4/5/6/7 Discourages students' participation. Participation

7. While criticizing the teachers' nonverbal behaviour is

Lenient and polite 1/2/3/4/5/6/7 severe and rigid

The points on rating scale denote the following:

1. Fully consistent (7) 2. Highly consistent (6)

3. Moderately consistent (5)                      4. Partially consistent (4)  
 5. Moderately inconsistent (3)    6. Highly inconsistent (2)  
 7. Fully inconsistent (1)

*Analysis and Interpretation of Data*

At this stage it is also worth mentioning that the focus of the study was nonverbal behaviour. The verbal behavior served as the context of nonverbal behaviour. The teachers' nonverbal behaviour scores of the analysis are provided in the table below;

*Hypothesis 1:* The teachers' nonverbal behaviour is consistent and coherent with their verbal behaviour.

*Table 3: The teachers' body language*

	Mean	S	Standard error	Z value	A 95% CI for Population Mean	
					Lower	Upper
While accepting students feelings	5.65	0.96	0.09	-2	5.47	5.83
While accepting students ideas	5.56	0.95	0.06	-3.5	5.53	5.77
While asking questions	5.68	0.94	0.09	-2	5.50	5.86
While lecturing	5.52	0.95	0.09	-2	5.34	5.7
While giving directions	5.56	0.97	0.09	-2	5.38	5.74
While criticizing	5.45	1.06	0.10	-2	5.25	5.65

$Z_{\frac{\alpha}{2}} = \pm 1.96$ , At 5% level of significance

The above table revealed that, the average nonverbal behaviour score of teachers was highly consistent and coherent with their verbal communication. The Z computed value clearly stated that research hypothesis  $H_1$  is accepted.

*Hypothesis 2:* There is significant difference between the nonverbal behaviour scores of male and female arts teachers

Table 4: Comparison between male and female arts teachers' nonverbal behaviour score, while accepting;

Categories	Gender	N	Mean	S	Standard error	Z
Students' feeling	M	54	5.69	0.98	0.133	0.43
	F	54	5.61	0.95	0.129	
Students ideas'	M	54	5.56	1.12	0.152	-0.05
	F	54	5.57	0.8	0.109	
Asking question	M	54	5.61	1.02	0.139	-0.72
	F	54	5.74	0.84	0.114	
Lecturing	M	54	5.46	1.06	0.144	-0.61
	F	54	5.57	0.72	0.098	
Giving directions	M	54	5.48	1.01	0.137	-0.62
	F	54	5.57	0.85	0.116	
Criticizing or justifying	M	54	5.26	1.14	0.155	-1.95
	F	54	5.65	0.92	0.125	

$Z_{\frac{\alpha}{2}} = \pm 1.96$ , at 5% level of significance

The data documented in the above table revealed that the calculated value is smaller than tabulated value at 5% level of significance. Therefore there is no difference between the average nonverbal communication scores of male and female arts teachers in different educational institutions.

*Hypothesis 3:* There is significant difference between the nonverbal behaviour scores of male and female arts teachers 'working in government, public, semi government & private standard schools.

Table 5: Comparison of nonverbal behaviour scores of teachers' working in different schools, while accepting;

Categories	Source of variation	df	Sum of	Mean Square	F	Significance level
------------	---------------------	----	--------	-------------	---	--------------------

			Square			
Students feeling	Types of school	2	0.68	0.34	0.36	0.05
	Teachers nonverbal behaviour	105	99.95	0.95		
Student ideas	Types of school	2	3.02	1.51	1.59	0.05
	Teachers nonverbal behaviour	105	99.53	0.95		
Asking questions	Types of school	2	11.13	5.57	6.88	0.05
	Teachers nonverbal behaviour	105	84.53	0.81		
Lecturing	Types of school	2	11.57	5.79	7.15	0.05
	Teachers nonverbal behaviour	105	85.39	0.81		
Giving Directions	Types of school	2	9.86	4.93	5.60	0.05
	Teachers nonverbal behaviour	105	92.69	0.88		
Criticizing	Types of school	2	16.35	8.18	8.26	0.05
	Teachers nonverbal behaviour	105	104.42	0.99		

F  $tab(2,105)$  value at 5% level of significance is 3.09.

The data in the above table revealed that the computed value of F-test statistic for the first two categories is less than F-tabulated value. It clearly indicates that no significance difference was found for first two categories. But, for the remaining four categories, the computed value of F-testis more than F-tabulated value. It implies that a significant difference was found between the nonverbal behaviour of arts teachers' working in government, private and semi government & private standard schools.

### Conclusions

From findings it was concluded that the 'non verbal cues of the teachers were found to be highly coherent with their verbal behavior while accepting students' feelings, ideas, while asking questions, lecturing, giving directions and criticizing. No significant difference was found between male and female arts teacher. Similarly, no differences were found between then on-verbal cues of teachers' working in government, private and semi government & private standard schools for the first two categories but for the remaining four categories a slight difference was found.

### Recommendations

Keeping the study limited to the teachers' nonverbal behaviour on students' learning performance of secondary schools' students, the students at high level may be comparatively analyzed. Body language and facial expressions are the preliminary types of nonverbal behaviour, if they are utilized by teacher properly; these can enhance and improve the understanding of students regarding the concept of teaching strategies in school.

### References

- Allan and Peas, B. The definite book of body language, 2011 ed. (Pease international, 2004).
- Baylor, A.L. et al., "Designing Nonverbal Communication for Pedagogical Agent," Computers in Human behaviour 25, no. 5 (2009).
- Walberg, H.J. "Productive teaching and instruction," phi Delta, Kappan 72 (1990).
- Flanders, N.A. "Analyzing teaching behaviour Reading. Mass," Addison-Wesley (1970).
- Given, D. B. The nonverbal dictionary of gestures, signs & body language cues (Washington: Centre for nonverbal studies press: Retrieved May 26, 2010, from <http://www.4shared.com/network/searches>, 2002).
- Smith, A.H. "Nonverbal communication in Teaching. ," Review of educational research 49, no. 4 (1981).
- Galloway, C.M. "Nonverbal," Theory into practice 16, no. 3 (1977).
- Devito, A.J. Human Communication (Boston, USA: Pearson Education, 2009).

Kodakos, A. & Polemikos, N. , (Retrieved from [http://cronk @ missouriwestern.edu](http://cronk@missouriwestern.edu), Nonverbal communication in kindergarten).

Santrock, J.W. Educational Psychology (second edition, Texas : MC Graw Hill, P.209, 2006).

Albert, E. Nonverbal Immediacy in the classroom. (Retrieved June 15, 2015: <http://cronk@missouriwestern.edu/>, 2006).

Flanders, N.A. (1970). Analyzing Teaching behavior Reading, Mass. Washington, D.C, Addison-Wesley (P.34).